# Mr. *Smith's*

# DEFENCE

OF THE

Doctrine of Believer's Baptiſm,

By Immerſion only.

# THE

# PREFACE.

SINCE *a* good Name is rather to be choſen than great Riches, *none can reaſonably blame me, for thus appearing in public, to vindicate my Character from the heavy, and unjuſt Charge alledged by* Mr. Jonathan Parſons, *in his Diſcourſes preached laſt Spring, at* Haverhill, *Weſt Pariſh, on the Subject of Infant Baptiſm; which he hath ſince printed: Nor for appearing in Vindication of the ſacred Ordinance of Believers-Baptiſm, againſt his unſcriptural Repreſentations. Yet my diſinclination for engaging in Controverſy, would have prevented theſe Sheets; had not the Solicitations of my Friends, my own Character, and the honour of God, prevailed above every other Conſideration.*

*Before I proceed to remark upon his Arguments ſet down in Favour of Infant Baptiſm, I ſhall briefly touch upon the Charge juſt hinted at.* * "Haverhill Weſt "Pariſh had been for ſome Months A-tiptoe after "a zealous Anabaptiſt Teacher, who contrary to "his

* Marginal Note, P. 12.

" his Engagements to me, has ſet up the practice " of rebaptiſing, and openly denying the Right of " Infant Baptiſm. How he will reconcile this to " the Gentleman, or the Chriſtian, after he had " promiſed to keep thoſe Notions private to him- " ſelf, I know not." *My Name indeed is not mentioned in the place referred to; yet from the Circumſtances related, all agree that I am pointed at. The Charge I totally deny: For to the beſt of my Knowledge, Mr.* P. *never required ſuch an Engagement of me, and ſurely I ſhould have been very unwiſe to have entered into it, unleſs it had been required; neither would his making ſuch a Requeſt, and my Compliance with it, have reflected any Honour or Credit, on his Piety or my Wiſdom. I am at a loſs to deviſe (if he believes what he has aſſerted) from what he could gather it, unleſs it was from my Expectation of travelling further to the Eaſtward, and ſaying I had no Tho'ts of ſettling in thoſe Parts, &c. which I might probably have told him, as that was the Caſe. But will my ſaying I did not expect to ſettle in thoſe Parts, but travel further to the Eaſtward, amount to an Engagement that I would not? Or will it amount to a breach of Promiſe, if being providentially detained, I have altered my Purpoſe? Let the Reader judge.*

*If a particular Relation of the concurring Circumſtances, which cauſed me to alter my Purpoſe, would not have ſwelled this Preface beyond due Bounds, I ſhould have related them here: But if the Public ſhould manifeſt a Deſire to hear them, they may be gratified hereafter. In the mean Time, it is ſufficient for me to have maintained a good Conſcience in thoſe Reſpects, notwithſtanding all the ill Uſage I have received from thoſe,*

of

*of whom better Treatment might have been reasonably expected.*

*In the Course of my Remarks upon the forementioned Discourses, I have made use of several Authors; to the most of which I have given sufficient Credit. And since Mr. P. in his Preface gives us no Reason to expect any thing new upon the subject of Baptism, he cannot reasonably find fault with me, if I should produce nothing new in his Confutation: Especially since the Arguments produced by him, have been judicially, and clearly refuted already by abler Hands. But why this Entrance upon the Controversy, if nothing was to be expected new? Are his personal Engagements he talks of, from countenancing an "Anabaptist Minister" sufficient? Or does his Influence extend so far, that nothing short of public Remonstrances, could prevent the supposed Mischief; that would ensue in Consequence of the Countenance he gave that Minister? The Sermons preached (even before they were printed) together with the many hard Sentences thrown out by him; and his Assiduity amongst those he could influence, had prejudiced the Minds of a great Number of People, against that Minister's Principles and Conduct. So that I verily think, we must seek for some other Motive, exciting to the Undertaking, besides the pretended Countenance he gave a certain "Anabaptist Minister's Undertaking: And it would be well if amusing the Minds of unwary Readers, and to keep them from forming their Principles from the Bible, was not the impulsive Cause.*

*I shall submit my Esteem of the Covenant of our God to the Reader's Judgment, as he will find my Sense of it expressed in the following Pages: So by comparing*

*comparing it with Mr.* P—'s *Sense of the Covenant, he may judge which of us thinks and speaks most consistently and worthily of it. How plain his Evidence for the Truth is; and how calmly he has treated the Subject, may be better determined by carefully perusing and comparing it with the Bible. And now to the candid Reader, I submit what is written; desiring the Blessing of him, whose Cause these Sheets are humbly designed to promote; and who himself was baptized by* John *in Jordan.*

H. S.

The

# The Doctrine of Believer's Baptiſm, by Immerſion only.

THIS defenſive piece makes its appearance, not with an expectation of entertaining the curious; nor from an ambitious deſire of being ſeen in public; but to remove the maſk, under which the ſermons which occaſioned it, came into the world: That truth might appear in its ſimple, artleſs dreſs; ſtript of all thoſe ſophiſtical arts, deſigned to decoy the unwary reader.

WE find in Acts 16. 32, 33, & 34.—That the Jaylor, and all that were in his houſe, had the word of the Lord ſpoken unto them: After which they were baptized, not in his houſe, altho' it was about midnight, when the ordinance of baptiſm was adminiſtred to them; but out of his houſe: It is probable in the river near the city of Philippi, Acts 16. 12, 13. *And when he had brought them into his houſe,*

*houſe, he ſat meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his houſe.* We may learn from hence, that the cuſtom of the Apoſtles was to baptize *abroad*, out of a houſe, as did John in a river; and to baptize ſuch who were capable of being inſtructed, and of believing; which is evident by the Jaylor and all his houſe rejoycing together. Joy being the effect of the believer's obedience in baptiſm, which was the caſe with the Eunuch, Act. 8. 39. *And when they were come up out of the water—he went on his way rejoycing.* And ſuch who thus obey Chriſt, have reaſon to rejoyce in his perſon, offices and righteouſneſs: Whoſe example in this ordinance of baptiſm they are enabled to obſerve, by ſtepping into the watry-grave. Which example being viewed by faith, gives us a lively view of Chriſt's death, burial and reſurrection; as well as our death unto ſin, and being raiſed unto newneſs of life: All which are pointed out in the mode of baptiſm; *therefore we are buried with him by baptiſm into death,* Rom. 6. 4. The mode of baptiſm, which the Apoſtle evidently alludes to here, is not only pointed out; but likewiſe the burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, as the head and repreſentative of all his people; of which burial and reſurrection, baptiſm is a lively emblem. Now ſince believers had a repreſentative being in Chriſt, before they had a perſonal exiſtence in the world, Eph. 1. 4.—2 Tim. 1 9. Surely the reaſon of their being Chriſt's diſciples, can't be becauſe they are the children of believing parents, as Mr. *Parſons* aſſerts; neither can their good qualities or moral duties be the procuring cauſe of ſuch a favour: Conſequently it muſt be owing to the

good

good will of a gracious God, in the diſplay of his love, by chooſing them in his ſon, who is God's elect in whom he delighted, Iſa. 42. 1. and with whom he early made a covenant, which covenant was to be ſealed with his own blood: Hence we have it, *By the blood of thy covenant I have ſent forth thy priſoners out of the Pit*, Zech. 9. 11. This covenant had certain conditions to be performed by Chriſt, who is termed *the meſſenger of the covenant*, Mal. 3. 1. And in conſequence of the fulfilment of theſe conditions by Chriſt, the way is open for the priſoners to be ſent forth out of the pit of ruin, and to enjoy all the bleſſings and privileges of the covenant. This covenant is that which is uſually called the covenant of grace.—Which, ſays Mr. P. "was primarily and principally with the Lord Jeſus "Chriſt, as the ſecond Adam, and therefore he is "called the ſurety of the covenant of grace, to ad- "juſt and make up the difference between God and "his people. But altho' the covenant of grace is "primarily made with Chriſt, as the repreſentative "of his ſeed, yet in him, it is made with believers "or with his ſeed." And thus the Aſſembly of Divines expreſs themſelves, "The covenant of "grace was made with Chriſt, as the ſecond Adam; "and in him with all the elect, as his ſeed."—From this view of the covenant of grace, we may readily ſee, the miſtake of Mr. P. in affirming "baptiſm to be the initiating ſeal of the covenant of grace."* Thus: "But when Chriſt came, and "would introduce a new diſpenſation of the cove- "nant of grace, he appointed baptiſm with water "to be the ſeal of initiation." If baptiſm initiates



* P. 36. and in P. 8.

us into the covenant of grace, then we may thank the miniſter that baptized us ; or our parents who were the means of it ; or ourſelves who voluntarily complied with it : And not Chriſt who is the mediator of that covenant. In the 9th page, referring to Acts 10. 45—48. he ſays, "But *Peter* "virtually teaches us, that water baptiſm is the "door of admiſſion into the viſible church now, "as circumciſion was formerly."

It may be obſerved, that *Peter* don't pay any regard there to the old admiſſion into the *Jewiſh* church, by circumciſion : But ſpeaks of the *Jews* admiſſion into the goſpel church-ſtate ; and now finding the ſame qualifications in the *Gentiles*, which were required of them before baptiſm, viz. faith and repentance, he aſks, who can forbid water ? &c.

I would further remark, If baptiſm is a door into the goſpel church, in the ſame ſenſe, and to be adminiſtred to the like ſubjects ; as circumciſion was to the *Jewiſh* church ; we muſt make the church national ; and *children* as well as *adults*, and *unbelievers* as well as *believers*, muſt have a right to all the privileges of the goſpel church, conſequently to the *Lord's ſupper*, that being one of its great privileges. For under the former diſpenſation, the *paſſover*, with the other privileges of that church, belonged to the members of it, whether young or old ; unleſs prohibited by reaſon of ſome ceremonial pollution. And this is carrying matters to the length which they prevailed, when *Infant Baptiſm* firſt took its riſe.

See

See *Ree*'s upon baptiſm,* where he quotes *Cyprian*'s own words for communicating infants. This *Cyprian* is one of the three, whom Mr. P. mentions, to prove the antiquity of *Infant Baptiſm.* Mr. *Stennet* quotes *Suicerus*, aſſerting the ſame. † "It "was thought fit in like manner to give it (viz. "the Lord's ſupper) to infants, after the intro- "duction of *Infant Baptiſm.*"

Let us now take notice of Mr. P—'s arguments for *Infant Baptiſm.* The firſt is, "If the "infants of viſible believers do alſo belong to the "viſible church themſelves, then they are to be "baptized; but the infants of viſible believers "are alſo members of the viſible church them- "ſelves: Therefore the infants of viſible believers "are to be baptized." I think this ſylogiſm would comport much better with ſcripture, had it been formed thus: If the infants of viſible believers do not belong to the viſible church themſelves, then they are not to be baptized; but the infants of viſible believers are not members of the viſible church themſelves: Therefore the infants of viſible believers are not to be baptized. This is obvious, both from their not having the badge of memberſhip put upon them; and their not being ſuch in a qualified ſenſe; altho' Mr. P. ſays they are ſo in a qualified ſenſe. "As a ſon born in the "army is the King's ſoldier, or a child born in the "King's dominions is the King's ſubject, tho' the "former is not actually inliſted, nor the latter "formerly declared to be ſo." I deſire to know from whence thoſe qualifications do ariſe, which make

* P. 110. † P. 86.

make the infants of visible believers, members of the visible church. Are they from their parents? No, for we find a profession of faith and repentance required, before even the sign of membership, or introduction into the visible church was to be granted, Acts 2. 38. & 8. 37. Now if they were members in a qualified sense, without the prerequisite just mentioned, then doubtless they would have a right to the badge of their membership: But they have no right to the badge of membership, without a profession of faith & repentance, as is evident from the passages just quoted: Therefore they are not members in a qualified sense. I would enquire, whether they are members in a qualified sense, from their capacity to receive the sign of membership? The *Heathens* are capacitated for the same; so they are from this, as much members of the visible church in a qualified sense, as the infants of visible believers. Again, does their membership spring from an inherent principle of holiness, with which they are born, the improvement of which, would cause them to grow more and more in grace, until they should arrive to a sufficient degree of holiness, exclusive of the work of regeneration? This is arminianism—bad divinity—dangerous doctrine—and inconsistent with orthodoxy.

YET this seems to be his opinion from the examples produced, if they make any thing to his purpose: For it must be granted that a son born in the army has all the parts of a man, or is a man compleat as to his members, tho' not perfect in his growth and strength, for the service of his king.

king. And as a child born in the King's dominions is the King's ſubject, by reaſon of his peculiar right in him as belonging to his kingdom; and having never forfeited his natural right to the privileges thereof; conſequently when he grows to the ſtature of a man, by virtue of his engagement of allegiance, he is put in a capacity of being advanced to, and made partaker of the honours, profits and immunities of the kingdom: And that without any internal change wrought in him, ſeeing he was born a ſubject in a qualified ſenſe. But ſurely Mr. P. will not conclude that perſons unrenewed have any right to, or capacity for the enjoyments and employments of Chriſt's ſpiritual kingdom; unleſs after all his zeal for the doctrines of grace, he has a mind to give up the important doctrine of regeneration; and ſubſtitute in its ſtead, that which is ſo much more agreeable to the carnal mind, viz. juſtification by the deeds of the law: And ſo ſubvert the very foundation, upon which he himſelf profeſſed to ſettle in *Newbury*. If Mr. P. does not like theſe hints, he muſt blame himſelf for not being more guarded in his compariſons; or for engaging in a cauſe that requires ſuch methods to ſupport it.

Says Mr. P. what is mainly before me upon this argument, is to prove, "That infants of viſi-
"ble believers or church members, are alſo them-
"ſelves members of the viſible church, and there-
"fore ought to have the ſeal of induction put
"upon them."

It may not be amiſs to refer the reader to ſeveral paſſages in Mr. P—'s ſermons upon baptiſm,

tiſm; and then leave him to judge of his meaning. In p. 6. he ſays, "That baptiſm is, by divine appointment, the badge of all the *diſciples* of Chriſt; and the introduction into the viſible church."—In p. 7. "Baptiſm is the ſeal of induction into the viſible church."—"And hence Chriſt, having received power from the Father, gave a commiſſion to his apoſtles, and to all his ordinary miniſters, to admit his diſciples into the church, by the ſacred rite of baptiſm with water." In p. 9. it is called "the ſeal of introduction into the chriſtian church"—and "the door of admiſſion into the viſible church."—"It was inſtituted—as the ordinary medium of gathering and preſerving the church." In p. 11. "Others, by their appointment, admitted members into the church, by that ſolemn rite"—i. e. baptiſm. In p. 13. "The infants of viſible believers are alſo members of the viſible church themſelves: Therefore the infants of viſible believers, are to be baptiſed:" In the ſame page. "So the children of viſible believers are members of the viſible church, as ſoon as they are born into the world, before they have the badge of membership put upon them." In p. 14. "All the admiſſions we read of (into the viſible church) ſince baptiſm was a divine inſtitution, were by this token or ſeal of the covenant.—P. 23. "Children come into a viſible church-ſtate, in the right of their parents."—P. 42. "It always has been the practice of the church, to initiate the infants of believers, by baptiſm."

FROM theſe quotations, with others of the like kind, deſignedly omitted, we may ſee the difficulty of

of reconciling what is aſſerted. For according to theſe citations, being members of the viſible church, gives a right to baptiſm : And baptiſm is that, by which perſons are introduced into the viſible church, and ſo become members.

From hence I would argue, If being members of the viſible church, gives a right to baptiſm; then none but ſuch as are members of the viſible church, have a right to baptiſm : But ſuch as are not members of the viſible church, have a right to baptiſm : Therefore being members of the viſible church, don't give a right to baptiſm. Again, " If baptiſm is an induction into the viſible church, then none but ſuch as are baptized can be members of the viſible church ; but baptiſm is an induction into the viſible church : Therefore none but ſuch as are baptized, can be members of the viſible church." The confeſſion of faith put out by the Aſſembly of Divines, in chap. 28 informs us, that " Baptiſm is a ſacrament of the New Teſtament, " ordained by JeſusChriſt, for the ſolemn admiſſion " of the party baptized into the viſible church."

Now if thus they are admitted by baptiſm, then it can't be as Mr. P. aſſerts, that they are in the church before baptiſm. In ſhort, you ſee, as juſt obſerved, when it ſuits him, being in the viſible church gives a right to baptiſm ; and then again, when it ſerves his turn, " baptiſm brings perſons into the viſible church." Thus ſelf-contradictory he ſpeaks.

To gain his point he gives us a deſcription of the covenant of works, and of the covenant of grace.

I am pleaſed with his deſcription of the covenant of works; but am at a loſs to know what he means by the covenant of grace, as he treats it. The Aſſembly of Divines, in anſwer to this queſtion, "With whom was the covenant of grace made?" I think ſpeak to purpoſe, thus; "The "covenant of grace was made with Chriſt, as the "ſecond Adam; and in him with all the elect, as "his ſeed." * And Mr. P—'s words are; "This "covenant of grace was primarily and principally "with the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as the ſecond Adam.— "Yet, in Him, it is made with believers or with "his ſeed."

When he is ſpeaking concerning the covenant of works, he tells us, the bleſſings offered in that covenant to *Adam*, and his ſeed, would have been ſecured to them had he continued in his integrity. Now I would aſk, Since Chriſt as a public head, has continued in his integrity, and fulfilled all the conditions, properly ſo called, of the covenant of grace, ſo that he ſays, *I have finiſhed the work which thou gaveſt me to do*; whether the bleſſings of the covenant of grace, of which Chriſt is the head; are not as ſecure as thoſe bleſſings of the covenant of works, of which *Adam* was the head; ſuppoſing him to have maintained his integrity? If the bleſſings of the covenant of grace are not, then Chriſt, as a public head, muſt be inferior to *Adam*, as a public head; which I ſuppoſe even Mr. P. would not chooſe to aſſert. If they are, then the bleſſings of the covenant of grace ſhall be granted to Chriſt's ſeed; and it is impoſſible for Chriſt's ſeed

* Larger Catechiſm, P. 64.

ſeed to break the covenant of grace, ſo as to be ejected from it, as Mr. P. inſinuates; where he ſays, "Hence they are ſaid, to enter into cove-"nant; to keep covenant; to break the cove-"nant; and ſuch like expreſſions;" quoting Pſal. 50. 5. and 25. 10. and Levit. 26. 15.

I WOULD obſerve, by taking theſe texts together, as here expreſſed, ſtrangely confounds the covenant of grace, and the covenant of works. By reading the 26th chapter of *Levit.* we may readily ſee, the covenant mentioned in the 15th ver. is not a covenant of grace, but chiefly reſpects temporal things.—Immediately upon ſo quoting this text in *Levit.* as to make his readers believe the covenant of grace is there meant—he adds, "And parents "that are believers, have their children taken into "covenant with them." By which it appears that he would have us think, that all the children of believing parents, are with their parents, taken into the covenant of grace. But before we can believe that, we muſt be convinced either that *Iſhmael* was taken into the covenant of grace with *Abraham*; and *Phineas* and *Hophni* with their father *Eli*; and *Abſalom* and *Ammon* with *David*, and ſo ſaved; and that all the children of believers are better than the children of unbelievers: Or, that perſons may be in the covenant of grace, and enjoy its bleſſings, ſuch as, effectual calling, juſtification, adoption and ſanctification, &c. and afterwards be finally loſt by breaking the covenant.

IN p. 17. after telling us what the *Antinomians* will object and ſay (and by his own conceſſions it

is judged he makes himself one) he says, All "be-"long either to the first or the second Adam. It "is impossible for a person to be under both cove-"nants at once" I would here ask, how those who belong to the covenant of grace can break it, so as to be finally ejected ? For if believers have their children taken into this covenant with them, then they must be saved ; or find some way to break it, so as to be utterly cast out of it : But we have just shewn that some were out of it, viz. *Ishmael, Phinehas, Hophni, Ammon* and *Absalom* ; hence they must either never have been in it, or have ejected themselves. From hence the inconsistency of this writer is very evident ; and will ever appear, unless he retracts what he has affirmed, that believers children are taken with them into the covenant of grace, by virtue of their parent's faith ; and that they are able to break the covenant of grace, &c —Such inconsistencies, are no small proof, that he wanted scripture to maintain his scheme : And a principle which must be supported without scripture for its foundation, ought to be rejected by all the lovers of truth.

We are informed, * "That outward privileges "avail nothing to special grace, any further than "means of God's appointing" Let it be observed, that *Infant Baptism* is not appointed by God ; so is not to be reckoned among the means of grace.

We now come to observe what he says upon the *Abrahamatical* covenant. † "The *Abrahamatical* covenant, including the seed of visible believers, is the covenant of grace." This he

* P. 18. † P. 18.

he endeavours to prove, and concludes "that none who have any tolerable underſtanding of the two covenants, and read with unprejudiced attention, can doubt whether it be the covenant of grace." Let the unprejudiced reader judge for himſelf, after obſerving

1. ACCORDING to the Aſſembly's larger catechiſm, "The covenant of grace, was made with Chriſt, as the ſecond Adam; and in him with all the elect, as his ſeed, Gal. 3. 16. Rom. 5. 15. to the end. How does this agree with making *Abraham* the head of the covenant? 2. None of the deſcendents of *Adam* were ever ſaved out of the covenant of grace; but a number of them were believers, who were not included in *Abraham's* covenant: Therefore they could not be ſaved, according to Mr. P. becauſe the covenant of grace was made with *Abraham*. Where then is *Adam*, *Abel*, *Enoch* and *Noah*, who were before *Abraham's* day, with many others? 3. None can be loſt who are included in the covenant of grace: But all *Abraham's* natural ſeed were included in the covenant made with *Abraham*, which Mr. P. affirms to be a pure covenant of grace; therefore according to him, none of *Abraham's* natural ſeed are loſt. This as evidently contradicts the ſcripture, as to ſay none before *Abraham's* day were ſaved, becauſe not included in *Abraham's* covenant, altho' they were righteous perſons.

To unlock this riddle we want the ſame key which the excellent Mr. *Morgan* mentions in his firſt book againſt Mr. *Finley*; * which he calls Mr. *Finley's*,

* P. 18.

*Finley*'s, and Mr. *Flavel*'s. "They could neither "be juſtified nor condemned in this life: Juſtifi- "ed they could not be, for they were out of *Abra-* "*ham's* covenant; condemned they could not be, "for they were righteous perſons. But this is not "all; in the world to come they could neither go to "heaven nor hell: To heaven they could not go, "becauſe out of *Abraham's* covenant; to hell they "could not go, becauſe juſtified. But ſtill it is "more wonderful to conſider, that they muſt be "fully [and perſonally] juſtified, and fully con- "demned at the ſame time: Fully juſtified, be- "cauſe the ſcripture ſays as much; fully condemn- "ed, becauſe out of the covenant made with *Abra-* "*ham*.—What an odd ſhaped covenant of grace "is this, that ſome believers or gracious perſons "muſt be left out; and ſome carnal unregenerate "ones taken in!" For Mr. P. affirms, that all church members and their ſeed, are in the covenant of grace. *

To confirm his aſſertion, he produces this paſſage; "I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations, for an everlaſting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee." This promiſe reſpects either all *Abraham's* natural legitimate ſeed, or all his ſpiritual ſeed, or both. If all his natural ſeed are meant, then this covenant muſt reſpect temporal things and external privileges; for we can't ſuppoſe all his natural ſeed were ſaved; which would have been the caſe, if the bleſſings of the covenant of grace are pointed out in it for all

* P. 18.

all his natural ſeed. If his ſpiritual ſeed are meant, then we may readily find out who they are, viz. ſuch who have faith in Chriſt. *They which be of faith are bleſſed with faithful Abraham. If ye be Chriſt's, then are ye Abraham's ſeed and heirs according to the promiſe,* Gal. 3. 9.—29.—This promiſe you have in Gen. 12. 3. or 17. 7.—But if this covenant ~~repreſents~~ both his natural & ſpiritual ſeed, then it muſt be a mixt covenant, conſiſting of ſpiritual and temporal bleſſings.

Now judge, whether it is proper to call the *Abrahamatical* covenant a pure covenant of grace, or not. In the 21ſt page we have it, "The grant in the *Abrahamatical* covenant, made to his ſeed, has never been repealed." Upon this in the language of Mr. *Morgan*, I would obſerve, "That "law which gave being to infant membership and "circumciſion, is aboliſhed by divine authority, as "a part of the former adminiſtration; this muſt "be granted, or elſe circumciſion is yet in force. "Now methinks it is a ſelf-evident truth, that "when a law which gives being to an ordinance "or appointment, is abrogated, that ordinance or "appointment is repealed. Again, that very co-"venant adminiſtration, whereby the *Jewiſh* na-"tion was taken into a viſible church-ſtate, is now "waxed old, and vaniſhed, *Heb.* 8. 8, 9. And "further, that church-ſtate wherein infants were "admitted as members and materials, is now a-"boliſhed. Since then we make appear from ſcrip-"ture, that the ſame divine authority, which gave "being to every particular, which you inſiſt upon "in defence of your principles, the ſame divine

"authority

" authority hath now diſannulled every one of " them, it remains therefore, for you to produce " expreſs ſcriptures to prove that infants are the " ſubjects of baptiſm, and members in the New " Teſtament church, otherwiſe they have no right " there by virtue of any former appointment."

Mr. P. ſays, * the reaſon why the *Abrahamatical* covenant is called *everlaſting*, is becauſe it was the covenant of grace. For an anſwer to which, ſee Jer. 31. 31, 32, 33. and Heb. 8. 7, 8, 9. *For if that firſt covenant had been faultleſs, then ſhould no place have been found for the ſecond*, &c. And ver. 13. *In that he ſaith, a new covenant he hath made, the firſt old; now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vaniſh away.* By theſe ſacred paſſages it is readily ſeen, that the *Abrahamic*-covenant in all its parts was not to be *everlaſting*, taking the word *everlaſting* in its ſtrict ſenſe.—But by the word *everlaſting* there, underſtand to the end of the former adminiſtration: Thus it was with the *Prieſt's* office, it ſhould be *Aaron's and his ſon's for a perpetual or everlaſting ſtatute*, Exod. 29. 9: And ſo it was with the ſacrifices, It ſhall be *a perpetual ſtatute*, Lev. 3. 17: And ſo with the atonement made once a year, *It ſhall be an everlaſting ſtatute*, Lev. 16. 34.

Nay, if that covenant was not abrogated, then *circumciſion* would ſtill be in force; but *circumciſion* is not in force: Therefore that covenant is abrogated. Say ſome, baptiſm comes in the room of *circumciſion*. But I deny it; for the ſcripture no

* P. 20.

no where informs us it does. The next remark is upon the olive tree, * alluding to *Rom.* 11. 16, 17. *For if the firſt-fruit be holy, the lump is alſo holy; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches. And if ſome of the branches be broken off, &c.* There "by *firſt fruits* the firſt "converts among the *Jews* under the goſpel "diſpenſation, are meant; it being uſual "with the apoſtle ſo to call them; ſee Rom. 16. "5. 1 Cor. 16. 15. And an alluſion is to the offer-"ing of the *firſt fruits* to the Lord, and the two "*wave loaves*, Levit. 23. 14—17. whereby the "whole lump was ſanctified, for after uſe though-"out the year following," &c. † Hence thoſe perſons who were firſt converted among the *Jews*, were preſages of the whole body who ſhould hereafter be called in, when *holineſs ſhould be written upon the bells of the horſes*, Zech. 14. 20, 21. And the *branches broken off* were ſuch, as were left out of the goſpel church gathered among them; into which goſpel church, the *Gentiles* were grafted, and not into the *Jewiſh* national church. Hence the *root* and *fatneſs* which they partook of, are not the privileges of the *Jewiſh* national church; but the privileges of the new teſtament church, of which Chriſt is the root or *foundation ſtone:* And believers are the materials, or *lively ſtones built up a ſpiritual houſe*, Eph. 2. 20. 1 Pet. 2. 5. Now the materials which formed the new teſtament church, were lively ſtones, who were ſo made by the ſpirit of God; and the prerequiſite to any perſon's being received into this church, was faith, or a profeſſion of it, Mark 16. 16. and Acts 8. 37. Which

 plainly

* P. 22. † Dr. Gill in Loc.

plainly ſhews us, that infants were not the materials of the new teſtament church at firſt. And I would aſk, by what command they are now brought into the church? By God's command? No. Hence I muſt conclude it to be a mere human invention, without benefit to the child, or command of God. This conſidered, the fallacy of this aſſertion is readily ſeen, * "That children "come into the viſible church-ſtate, in the right of "their parents, &c.—and continue members of the "viſible church, unleſs by their own actual ſins, "they cut themſelves off." Children can't as formerly under the old adminiſtration, be brought into the church by their parents, in obedience to a divine command; becauſe there is no command for it now. A profeſſion of faith is required of the ſubjects themſelves, before they are to be admitted into the chriſtian church: But it was not ſo with the *Jewiſh* church, under the former diſpenſation.

The next thing to be conſidered, is, † "The "infants of viſible believers, or ſuch as are mem-"bers of the viſible church, are diſciples of Chriſt." How does this agree with what Chriſt ſays, ‡ *If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and ſiſters, yea, and his own life alſo, he cannot be my diſciple.—And whoſoever doth not bear his croſs and come after me, cannot be my diſciple.—So likewiſe, whoſoever he be of you, that forſaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my diſciple?* He grounds his aſſertion

* P. 23. † P. 24. ‡ Luke 14. 26, 27—33.

aſſertion upon the commiſſion, * and to eſtabliſh it, quotes Gal. 3. 8, 9.—Upon which quotation I would obſerve, that the apoſtle there alludes to that covenant in Gen. 12. 3. which was renewed in the 17th chap. to underſtand which, ſee Gal. 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his ſeed were the promiſes made. He ſaith not, and to ſeeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy ſeed, which is Chriſt.*—And in ver. 9. *So then they which be of faith, are bleſſed with faithful Abraham.* And before we are to be reckoned his ſeed, we muſt be believers in Chriſt, ver. 29. *And if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye Abraham's ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe.* From theſe texts, we may ſee, the promiſed bleſſings of the covenant of grace, were not deſigned for *Abraham's* natural ſeed as ſuch But for him and all his ſpiritual ſeed; which ſeed may be known, by their faith on Chriſt, in whom all ſpiritual bleſſings are, Col. 1. 19. *For it pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.—Who is the mediator of a better covenant, which was eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*, Heb 8. 6. This is the covenant of grace which has taken place, and ſhines with ſuch clearneſs, that it dazzles the eyes of thoſe who adhere to the old covenant, ſpoken of in Heb. 8. 13.

THIS new covenant, the miniſters of Chriſt are to teach all nations, and ſhew wherein its ſuperior excellency lies: And when they are ſo taught, that they believe on Chriſt who is *Abraham's* ſeed, to whom the promiſes are, Gal. 3. 16. and who is the head of the covenant; then they are to be baptized, which is according to the com-

 miſſion,

* Matth. 28. 19, 20.

miſſion, *Go and teach all nations*, &c. "The com-
"miſſion is, (ſays he *) to make all nations diſci-
"ples, that were willing to enter into Chriſt's
"ſchool." Let it be obſerved, that the diſciples muſt be willing to enter into Chriſt's ſchool. Can this be ſaid of infants, who are incapable of inſtruction, or manifeſting any willingneſs to enter into Chriſt's ſchool? But in the ſame page, I am ſorry to find him inverting the very order of the ſame commiſſion, and virtually denying what he juſt affirmed; thus, "And the firſt thing the "apoſtles and miniſters of Chriſt have in charge, "is to baptize and teach." Thus you ſee how he twiſts, turns and changes the order of the commiſſion, to make good his practice. Tenets which can only be vindicated by ſuch unrighteous methods as theſe, in my judgment, reflect no great honour upon the miniſters engaged to ſupport them.

I SHALL here take liberty to quote Mr. Stennet, upon Chriſt's commiſſion to baptize, † with ſome alterations. Mr. P—'s notion on this text ſeems to be, "that here is a general command to diſciple "all nations; and then the way to execute it, "particularly expreſſed, firſt by baptizing, and "then by teaching: So that according to him, "thoſe are diſciples who are baptized, tho' they "have never been taught, nor are yet capable of "inſtruction; and he ſeems to lay a great ſtreſs "on this for infant baptiſm, therefore I ſhall anſ-"wer it the more largely.—— 1. I ſhall deny that "any can be made diſciples without being taught, "till

* P. 25. † Stennet againſt Ruſſen, p. 16, 17.

" till an inſtance from the holy ſcripture be pro-
" duced of ſome diſciple made by Chriſt, or by
" any of his miniſters without teaching; and ſuch
" teaching or inſtruction, as implies great and good
" effect on their ſouls, viz. their faith in Chriſt,
" and ſubjection to his goſpel, or a profeſſion of
" it: For who can pretend to make diſciples any
" other way than after the primitive manner? 2.
" That none can be a diſciple of Chriſt without
" this, appears by the words of our bleſſed Saviour
" himſelf, already quoted, Luk. 14. 26. 27—33.
" Now if Chriſt ſays no man can be his diſciple,
" without being ſo taught by him, and ſo learn-
" ing of him as to take up his croſs and follow
" him; and Mr. P. ſays he may be a diſciple
" without teaching; whom are we to believe?
" 3. I would aſk, to whom are the miniſters of the
" goſpel ordered to adminiſter baptiſm? Is it to
" all men in general in all nations, or to thoſe
" only who are made diſciples in all nations? If
" all men in general are to be baptized firſt, and
" then taught; then all adult perſons as well as
" infants, ought to be baptized before they are
" taught (which I ſuppoſe no one will aſſert) if
" only thoſe who are made diſciples in all nations
" are to be baptized, then there is ſomething re-
" quired to make diſciples before baptiſm; and
" what can this be but teaching? If there is any
" other way, let it be ſhewn. 4. Our Saviour's
" way, and that of *John the baptiſt*, was to make diſ-
" ciples firſt, and then to admit them to baptiſm;
" for the text expreſly tells us, that *Jeſus made and*
" *baptized more diſciples than John.* Here ſeems a
" plain diſtinction between making diſciples, and

" baptizing

" baptizing them : And who gives Mr. P. licenſe
" to invert the order of Chriſt's words ?—5. The
" commiſſion, as expreſſed in a parallel text by
" another Evangeliſt, plainly directs that teaching
" ought to precede baptiſm : *Preach the goſpel to*
" *every creature : He that believeth, and is baptized,*
" *ſhall be ſaved.* Which words ſhew the exact
" order that is to be obſerved ; firſt there muſt
" be *preaching*, then *believing (for faith comes by*
" *hearing)* and then baptizing. 6. The practice of
" the apoſtles abundantly confirms this ; for we
" find they firſt taught the people to whom they
" came, exhorting them to repentance and faith,
" and then to be baptized : And we read of none
" admitted to baptiſm, but thoſe who made a
" ſolemn profeſſion of repentance and faith.—If
" then the order and method which Chriſt has
" eſtabliſhed is not to be inverted, why does Mr.
" P. take the liberty to invert it, by telling us,
" that miniſters are firſt to baptize, and then to
" teach ; tho' Chriſt bids them firſt to teach, and
" then baptize ?"

To gain his point, that infants of viſible believers are the diſciples of Chriſt, he quotes Acts 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the diſciples ?* Scripture is a chain beautifully linked together, hence one part can't croſs or contradict another. I have ſhewn already in the ſcripture ſenſe, that infants can't be diſciples. Neither are infants here meant by diſciples : But ſuch perſons who had embraced the truth. To prove which, ſee ver. 1—14.—31.—by which we learn they were capable of being *taught*, *ſubverted* from the

the truth, and of *rejoycing for the conſolation.*—Which characters don't belong to infants.

His third argument concerning federal holineſs, now comes under notice.* "Thoſe children, ſays he, that are federally holy, are to be "baptized; but the infants of viſible believers, "are federally holy: Therefore the infants of vi-"ſible believers, are to be baptized." In my opinion, this ſyllogiſm would have been conſiſtent with truth, had he form'd it thus: None but thoſe children that are federally holy, are to be baptized; but neither the infants of viſible believers, nor any other infants, as ſuch, are federally holy: Therefore no infants are to be baptized.—To his ſyllogiſm he ſubjoins, "Perhaps no ſectary, that al-"lows chriſtian ſacraments, will deny, that federal "holineſs gives a viſible right to baptiſm." This is to be denied, and will be, while we find it is not what Mr. P. calls federal holineſs, which is required in the bible, of perſons to be baptized: But a profeſſion of their faith in Chriſt. As already obſerved, Mark 16. 16. Acts 8. 37. & 16. 31, 32, 33. This profeſſion of faith made by the proper ſubjects of baptiſm, is very different from federal holineſs, and quite another thing. It may be obſerved, that even being in the covenant of grace, don't give a right to an ordinance of God; but only his divine command: Much leſs then does federal holineſs give a right to any. That a right to an ordinance of God, depends upon God's command, may appear from *Melchiſedeck*, *Lot*, with others, who were in the covenant of grace, but had

* P. 27.

had no right to circumciſion. Why ſo? becauſe not commanded.—Nay, tho' *Abraham* was in the covenant of grace which was made known to him, twenty four years before he was circumciſed, Gen. 12. 3. and 17. 1——4. yet he had no right to that ordinance till he received it from God by command.

Now I argue, if being in covenant did give no right to circumciſion, but God's command; that being in covenant now, don't give a right to baptiſm, much leſs a federal holineſs: But God's command, in which is included every prerequiſite to that ordinance. Now no infants are commanded to be baptized; therefore have no right to it.—Under this argument Mr. P. tells us of the covenant made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, which we have already conſidered; to which I would add, 2 Sam. 23. 5. *Altho' my houſe be not ſo with God; yet he hath made with me an everlaſting covenant ordered in all things and ſure.* It may be remembred that *Ammon*, *Abſalom* and *Adonijah*, are fragrant proofs, that Mr. P—'s way of reaſoning will not do. Who ſays, "The covenant of grace is made "with parents and their children."

THIS federal holineſs, which he thinks gives the children of believing parents, a right to baptiſm, I ſuppoſe he takes from 1 Cor. 7. 14. *For the unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is ſanctified by the huſband: elſe were your children unclean; but now are they holy.* Which holineſs he thinks, is not a principle of grace, nor a matrimonial, but a federal holineſs.

Note,

Note, he now makes federal holineſs, that, which gives a right to baptiſm. But a few pages paſt, it was perſons being in the church which gave that right; and what he will pitch upon next, I know not: Unleſs he ſhould add to the holy ſcriptures, which require a profeſſion of faith and repentance previous to baptiſm. * *If thou believeth with all thine heart, thou mayſt.* † *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt.* ‡ *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved.*

I MUST upon this text fall in with Mr. *Stennet*, *Wilſon*, *Jerom*, *Ambroſe*, *Eraſmus*, *Camerarius*, *Muſculus*, and many others; who judge a matrimonial holineſs to be meant. What I underſtand by matrimonial holineſs, is legitimacy: And by uncleanneſs there, illegitimacy; ſeeing the prophet when ſpeaking againſt poligamy, § calls the iſſue of a lawful marriage a godly ſeed; in oppoſition to a ſpurious or illegitimate ſeed; which ſeed ſprang from the *Jews* cohabitation with other nations, contrary to God's command: ‖ Which wives they were ordered to put away. ¶

THE act of marriage, in the language of the *Jews*, is expreſſed by "being ſanctified; many "inſtances to confirm this might be produced from "the *Miſnic*, *Talmudic* and *Rabinnic* writings, as "well as from *Maimonides*: Hence it can't be ſuch "a *ſanctification* as to communicate internal holi-"neſs, nor federal holineſs; but that which renders



* Acts 8. 37. † Acts 2. 38. ‡ Mar. 16. 16. § Mal. 2. 15. ‖ Deut. 7. 3, 4. ¶ Ezra. 10. 3.—10, 11.

" the offspring lawfully begot, and not baſtards,
" as theſe were formerly accounted, who ſprung
" from the cohabitation of *Jews* and *Gentiles.*" *
Mr *Stennet* againſt *Ruſſen*, † ſays, " Seeing the un-
" believing parent is ſaid in this text to be ſancti-
" fied by the believer; without which, according
" to the apoſtle's argument, their children could
" not be holy; the holineſs of the children here
" ſpoken of muſt be derived, as well from the
" ſanctification of the unbelieving parent, as that
" of the believer; and therefore muſt regard the
" lawfulneſs of their conjugal relation. And if
" they are ſaid to be ſanctified in this reſpect, the
" ſanctity of the children, which is derived from
" it, can riſe no higher than the ſource from whence
" it flows, and may well be underſtood of their le-
" gitimacy. Whatever holineſs is aſcribed to the
" children, one of whoſe parents is a believer; the
" apoſtle does not here ſuggeſt in the leaſt that
" infants ought to be baptized: Nor can this be
" inferred, for we have proved before, that a credi-
" bleprofeſſion of faith and repentance, ought to
" be made by all thoſe who are admitted to bap-
" tiſm, before they can juſtly be accounted proper
" ſubjects of that ordinance."

I WOULD add, if it is a holineſs which gives the children a right to baptiſm, upon one of their parents embracing chriſtianity; then all the children of ſuch parents muſt have a right to it, from the qualification derived from their parents, let them be of any age whatſoever, even fifty years old: For the text don't ſay, or elſe were your *infants* unclean;

* P. 248. † Dr. Gill in Loc.

unclean; but elſe were your *children* unclean; but now are they holy.—And children remain children, thro' every period of life. Again, if children have a right to baptiſm, by virtue of this holineſs, then ſurely the unbelieving parent muſt have a right to baptiſm too, ſince this holineſs which is ſaid to give a right to it, is derived as much from the unbelieving parent, as the believing parent.—And the ſanctity derived, can't excel the ſcource from whence it ſprings.

HAVING ſhewn what this holineſs is, we paſs to his *fourth* argument, * "That doctrine which in-"fers all infants to be in the viſible kingdom of "ſatan, is certainly falſe doctrine But the doct-"rine that denies all infants to be members of the "church, infers them to be members of the viſible "kingdom of ſatan: Therefore it is falſe doct-"rine." If Mr. P. means by the viſible kingdom of ſatan, all who are not in the ſcripture ſenſe, members of the goſpel viſible church, then the enquiry is, whether infants are taken into the goſpel viſible church or not? This muſt be decided, not by one aſſerting they are, and another they are not: But by the infallible word of God. It has been already prov'd, that in the ſcripture ſenſe, the meet ſubjects of the goſpel church are ſuch, who are capable of profeſſing their faith in Chriſt, which infants cannot do. The goſpel churches, mentioned in Acts 1. 14. and 2. 42. and chap. 8. make nothing *for* our opponents; but rather *againſt* them; ſeeing they were only men and women, and ſuch as were capable of continuing *in prayer and the apoſtle's doctrine.*



* P. 34.

I CAN find no account of any infants being baptized and received into the church, neither in ſacred or profane hiſtory, till the latter end of the ſecond, or beginning of the third century. When the man of ſin prevailed much, and corruptions crept very faſt into the church—communicating infants, with baptiſing bells, meeting houſes, and what not, with infant baptiſm, then took place according to hiſtory. It is the ſcripture-doctrine then, according to Mr. P. which is falſe; becauſe it will not join with him to admit infants as members of the viſible church: Conſequently, in his language, they are the "members of the viſible kingdom of ſatan." For he aſſerts, there is no medium between the viſible kingdom of Chriſt, and the viſible kingdom of ſatan. One would have thought a gentleman who adheres to the human device of half-way membership, would have held to a medium between Chriſt's vifible kingdom and ſatan's; but it ſeems he does not. He tells us, "the only ground of hope that we can have of "their (viz. infants) being the members of Chriſt, "by a real and vital union with him, ariſes from "their viſible membership." I am ſorry to find one, who has violently withſtood the torrent of *Arminianiſm*, in theſe parts heretofore, now ſo publickly to patronize it, and give it ſuch a kind reception as he does here.

HERE obſerve, he makes the ground of our hope, for our children, not to ariſe from God's electing love; nor from the covenant of grace, in which all the elect were included; nor from Chriſt's ſatisfaction made for ſin, and procuring a righteouſneſs

righteouſneſs for all that the father gave him: But either from what they derive from their believing parents, by their birth: For according to him, they are born members of the church; or, from what the parents or ſome friend, with the miniſter, have done for them. This is excluding free grace to a great degree, and ſtrikes directly againſt the following texts, *Not by works of righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his mercy he ſaved us, by the waſhing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghoſt.* * *Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the fleſh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* † Inſtead of embracing ſuch paſſages of ſacred writ, this muſt be the tenor of his doctrine; either by natural deſcent from believing parents, or rather by our baptiſmal work, all our hopes for our children, dying in infancy, ariſe. This is not only corrupt, but very dangerous doctrine, which ſuits the arminian taſte, upon which doubtleſs many will feaſt: And may cauſe them to argue in this ſort, If we can do ſo much for the ſalvation of our children, ſurely we may do ſomething for our own, &c. which would be juſt reaſoning from ſuch a tenet.

To render his argument more plauſible he quotes Matt. 19. 14. *Suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto me: for of ſuch is the Kingdom of heaven.* This I think will not ſerve his end, if we conſider the 13th ver. which informs us, for what end they were brought to Chriſt, not to be baptized, for *Chriſt baptized none.* Joh. 4. 2. But *that he ſhould put his hands on them and pray.* Theſe children

* Tit. 3. 5. † Joh. 1. 13.

dren might have been either diſeaſed, and for that end brought to Chriſt to be cured; or, might have been brought to him, as ſome great prophet, to be bleſſed by him, according to the antient cuſtom. Gen. 48. 14, 15, 16. By whom they were brought, is uncertain; whether by their parents or nurſes; whether by moral or immoral perſons; whether by church members or not. I think "This is to "ſhew his humility, that he was not above taking "notice of any; and to teach his diſciples to re- "gard the weakeſt believers, and ſuch as were but "children in knowledge: And to inform them "what all ought to be who expect the king- "dom of heaven; for it follows, *forbid them not to "come unto me, for of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven:* "Forbid them not, now, or at any other time." And it is, as if the Lord ſhould ſay, "Don't "drive away theſe children from my perſon or pre- "ſence; they are lively emblems of the proper "ſubjects of a goſpel church-ſtate, and of ſuch as "ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven. By "theſe I may inſtruct and point out to you, what "converted perſons ſhould be, who have a place "in my church below, and expect to enter into "my kingdom and glory above; that they are or "ought to be, like ſuch children, harmleſs and "inoffenſive; free from rancor and malice, meek, "modeſt, and humble; without pride, ſelf-con- "ceit, and ambitious views, and deſires of gran- "deur, and ſuperiority. Chriſt's entire ſilence a- "bout the baptiſm of infants at this time, when "he had ſuch an opportunity of ſpeaking of it to

"his

" his diſciples, had it been his will has no favour-
" able aſpect on ſuch a practice." *

LET us now remark upon his fifth argument, †
" That doctrine which renders the privileges of
" the *chriſtian* church, leſs than the privileges of
" the *Jewiſh* church, is certainly falſe doctrine :—
" But the doctrine which excludes the infants of
" viſible believers from the initiating ſeal of the
" covenant of grace, viz. baptiſm, makes the pri-
" vileges of the *chriſtian* church leſs than the pri-
" vileges of the *Jewiſh* church ; therefore it is
" falſe doctrine." Here he makes baptiſm to bring infants into, and ſeal them in the covenant of grace. If it is ſo, then all the children of viſible believers who are baptized, muſt be entitled to the bleſſings of that covenant, which are juſtification, adoption, ſanctification, and the gift of the holy Ghoſt, &c. But will any one dare to affirm, that every baptized infant has theſe, or are entitled to them ? No, unleſs he holds that they who were once in the covenant of grace may finally fall from it. In this place he inſinuates that baptiſm brings the children of believing parents into the covenant of grace ; and before, ‡ that they were taken into the covenant of grace, becauſe they were believers children : " And parents that are believers, have their children taken into covenant with them." The reader may eaſily ſee, another inconſiſtency here ; for if they are brought into the covenant of grace on their parents account, then not by baptiſm ; or if by baptiſm, then not on their parents account : For there can't

* Dr. Gill in Loc. † P. 35. & 36. ‡ P. 16.

can't be two oppoſite ways to bring the ſame perſon or perſons into the covenant of grace. I ſuppoſe if he ſhould treat upon ſome other ſubject, he would tell us, that the elect were not taken into the covenant of grace, by parents, nor by baptiſm, nor by any works of their own, but were included in it, when firſt made with Chriſt from everlaſting.

As to the privileges of the *chriſtian* church being leſs than the privileges of the Jewiſh church, becauſe of the denial of infant baptiſm; is mere noiſe without any ſubſtance. For we believe they are by far greater, agreeable to 2 Cor. 3. 10. *Even that which was made glorious, had no glory in this reſpect, by reaſon of the glory that excelleth.*

1. UNDER the preſent diſpenſation, the bleſſings of the covenant of grace, which were darkly exhibited by figures, types and ſhadows under the former, ſhine in their unbeclouded luſture.

2. THE goſpel church far exceeds the *Jewiſh* church in glory: The *Jewiſh* church was made up of lively and dead materials, but the goſpel church, of profeſſed lively materials, 1 Pet. 2. 5. *Ye alſo as lively ſtones are built up a ſpiritual houſe.*

3. INFANTS were circumciſed and ſo bound to keep the whole law, from which bondage we are now delivered. Gal. 5. 1,—3. *Stand faſt therefore in the liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. For I teſtify again to every man that is circumciſed, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.* Which yoke ſome of the *judaiſing teachers* had a mind to impoſe

impoſe upon the diſciples of Chriſt, as may be ſeen in Acts 15. 1,—5,—10. but *the apoſtle withſtood* them, and aſked them *why they tempted God to put a yoke upon the neck of the diſciples?* Now if infant baptiſm did come in the room of circumciſion, is it not likely at ſuch a time as this, when there were ſuch warm diſputes about it, as in the chap. juſt quoted, that mention would have been made of it? It might have readily ſilenced the *judaiſing Teachers*; but not a word of this: which is a ſtrong argument that it did not come in the room of it. Nay thoſe who affirm that baptiſm come in the room of circumciſion do it without any divine warrant, there being no text in the whole bible to prove it.

4. But the *Pedobaptiſts* ſay we leſſen the privileges of the goſpel, by not admitting infants into the goſpel church, ſeeing the infants of the *Jews*, were admitted into the *Jewiſh* church. — Upon which I would obſerve, 1. It was a privilege to the children of the *Jews* to be admitted into the *Jewiſh* church, in their infancy, by circumciſion: but it is no privilege to our children to be admitted into the goſpel church in their infancy by baptiſm. 2. The *Jewiſh* infants were admitted into their church in conſequence of God's command: but there is no command to baptize our infants. 3. By baptizing our children and taking them into the goſpel church, we leſſen the glory of the building, which is to conſiſt of *lively ſtones*; but infants, as ſuch, are dead materials: Hence have no right there, and do mar the glory of it. 4. The privileges of God's children are leſſened by admitting improper ſubjects, to partake of them. 5. I can't find that it does infants any good to

baptize them; or that such have any superior privilege (which will be of any real service to them) to those who are not baptized. 6. The partition wall is now broken down between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and God's church not confined to one nation as formerly.

HAVING thus considered his fifth argument, the sixth now comes in course. "If it was the "approved practice of the church in the apostle's "days, and so downward, to introduce the children "of visible believers into the christian church, by "the seal of baptism; then the infants of such "parents ought to be baptized: But it was the "approved practice in the time of the apostles, "and so downward thro' all periods of the church, "therefore the children of such parents ought to "be baptized." This syllogism might have been better expressed, thus: If it was not the approved practice of the church in the apostles days, and so immediately downward, to introduce the children of visible believers into the christian church, by baptism; then the infants of such parents ought not to be baptized: But it was not the approved practice in the time of the apostles, and so downward, therefore the children of such parents are not to be baptized—and if not such, then no other infants.

MR. P. to prove the first part of his syllogism, "That it was the approved practice in the time "of the apostles, and so downward, to introduce "the children of visible believers into the christian "church, by the seal of baptism," tells us of *Zaccheus*: * "By virtue of his interest in the cove-

"nant

* Luke 19. 9.

"nant which God made with *Abraham*, Chriſt ap-
"plied the promiſe to his houſe, i. e. to his chil-
"dren whether young or old." He ſhould have firſt told us, that Zaccheus was a married man, and had children, and then proved it, before he aſſerted the promiſe was made to his children. This looks much like the argument to maintain infant baptiſm, taken from Lydia and her houſhold. The good woman, no one can prove, was ever married or had any children. Poor foundation to maintain a practice of ſuch a ſolemn nature upon! Again, "This day is ſalvation come to this houſe, for as much as he alſo is the ſon of *Abraham*." Is it not very common, if but one ſoul is converted in a family, to ſay ſalvation is come to ſuch a houſe? And from thence we don't conclude, that every individual in ſuch a family is converted, or become related to Chriſt. I ſuppoſe by this text we are to underſtand either Chriſt's perſonally going to *Zaccheus*'s houſe; or his ſpiritually entering into his heart by his grace. If the firſt, the reaſon is here given, becauſe he is the ſon of *Abraham* by natural deſcent, ſo that the *Jews* could not reflect upon him for going to one of another nation, ſince he was ſent only to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of *Iſrael*.—If the ſecond, the reaſon is, becauſe he is the ſon of *Abraham* in a ſpiritual ſenſe; who is termed the *father of the faithful*. This ſeems to be the ſenſe which Mr. *Whitefield* puts upon it, when he ſays, * "The converſion of the perſon "referred to in the text, I think will be of no ſmall "ſervice to us in this matter."

In this ſixth argument, he calls baptiſm a ſeal; "by the ſeal of baptiſm;" as he did in his fifth



* His Sermon upon Luk. 19. 9, 10.

argument — "Initiating ſeal of the covenant of grace, viz. baptiſm." Mr. *Rees* may ſpeak here: * —— "However Mr. W. freely and frequently "calls it a ſeal of the covenant of grace: Whereas "the goſpel is a ſtranger, not only to the phraſe, but "to the idea annexed to it, for baptiſm will ſecure "or ſeal none to eternal life: Such only ſhall be "ſaved, who thro' grace are intereſted in the blood "of the everlaſting covenant. Therefore let not "parents flatter themſelves, and their children in "this point; nor ſuffer themſelves to be deceived "by the empty appellations, and groundleſs no-"tions, that their teachers may have inſtilled into "them; for according to the goſpel, the holy "Ghoſt is the only one; and his grace the only "qualification, that can be ſaid to ſeal the cove-"nant of grace, to thoſe who are ſaved. Eph. 1. "13. *In whom alſo, after that ye believed ye were "ſealed with the holy ſpirit of promiſe.* Chap. 4. 30. "*And grieve not the holy ſpirit of God, whereby ye are "ſealed to the day of redemption.* 2 Cor. 1. 22. *Who "hath alſo ſealed us, and given us the earneſt of the "ſpirit in our hearts.* Simon Magus had a clearer "right to baptiſm, in *Foro Eccleſiæ*, in the account "of the church, than any infants can pretend to. "For he was admitted upon profeſſion of faith, "and yet his baptiſm was far from being a ſeal of "the covenant of grace to him; for the man was "ſtill in the *gall of bitterneſs, and bond of iniquity.* "Acts 8. 13,—23. And there are too many de-"plorable inſtances, among all denominations of "thoſe who have been baptized, whether in in-"fancy or when adult, who teſtify by their works, "that

* In Anſwer to Walker, P. 66.

" that they are utter ſtrangers, to the grace of the " covenant of faithful *Abraham*. I ſhall only add, " that I am well aware that divers of the fathers " ſtiled baptiſm, the ſeal ; but does the ſcripture " call it ſo ? Some of the fathers made it neceſſary " to ſalvation, but does it therefore follow, that it " is ſo ? The *Romiſh* church is indeed of that o- " pinion, but very few *Proteſtants* who have bet- " ter ſtudied the ſcriptures, will offer to maintain " ſuch a doctrine. But to cloſe this head, a ſeal " was only one of the familiar but arbitrary names, " which the antients gave to baptiſm. And who- " ſoever will conſult *Gregory Nazianzen*'s fortieth " oration, will find a catalogue of ſuch names, to- " gether with the reaſons they thought proper to " aſſign for them, in thoſe days ; and the particu- " lar reaſon he gives, why baptiſm is called a ſeal, " is, in his own words, delivered thus : *A ſeal, as* " *keeping and denoting dominion.* What ſignifi- " cancy there is in theſe expreſſions, I muſt leave " for the reader to judge."

I FIND under this argument, *Cornelius* and the *Jaylor* mentioned : Here let the reader take notice, that *Cornelius* and his houſhold, were all capable of hearing, and in hearing, to *receive the Holy Ghoſt*, and *ſpeak with tongues* and *magnify God*, Acts 10. 33—44. 46. Which characters don't agree with infants. And as to the jaylor and his houſhold, they were capable of hearing and receiving inſtruction ; which is evident from the apoſtle, ſpeaking to him and all his houſe, and their being able to rejoyce and believe in God, Acts 16. 32,—34. *And they ſpake unto him the word of the Lord,*

*Lord, and to all that were in his houſe. And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them and rejoyced, believing in God with all his houſe.* Which characters agree not to infants. So from theſe texts there is no ground for infant baptiſm: But rather to the contrary. After Mr. P—'s quoting, "Walk before me, and be thou perfect; and I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, to be a God to thee, and to thy ſeed after thee." He ſays, * "The utmoſt "intended by theſe promiſes is, that they ſhould "enjoy the bleſſings of church privileges, and the "external means of ſalvation; and on theſe ac-"counts be diſtinguiſhed from all others." I don't find that there is one privilege, or any means of ſalvation, which baptized children, as ſuch, have; that unbaptized children have not: And ſhould be glad, if our opponents would inform the world of their ſuperior privileges and means, if there be any; and if they can find none, its time to drop this trite aſſertion, juſt to amuſe the ignorant. I acknowledge it was an advantage to the *Jewiſh* infants, to be circumciſed; for unleſs they were, they were to be cut off from the privilege of partaking of the *Paſſover*, and of hearing the law and prophets expounded; which the apoſtle points out to be the chief profit of circumciſion. †

In this our privilege is much enlarged under the preſent diſpenſation; for the goſpel is to be preached to every creature, without any previous qualification in the hearer, and upon hearing and believing they are to be baptized, Mark 16. 15, 16.

And

* P. 40. † Rom. 3. 1, 2.

And thoſe who believe, are ſuch, whom the Lord our God calls; to whom the promiſe is. Acts 2. 39. *For the promiſe is unto you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* Hence it is evident, if it ſhould be aſked, to whom is this promiſe in Acts 2. 39? The anſwer is ready: To all, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, whom the Lord ſhall call.—The promiſe is the ſame to the children, parents, and to them afar off: Hence to argue from this text, that believing parents are to get their children baptized, becauſe the promiſe is to them, don't appear to be the deſign of the holy Ghoſt in it. We might as well argue from this text that the promiſe is to their children, ſo thoſe who are afar off are to be baptized; or the promiſe is to them afar off, and ſo the parents are to be baptized; as to ſay, becauſe the promiſe is to the parents: Therefore the children are to be baptized.—For the promiſe is no more, to one than to the other; and they are brought to poſſeſs the promiſe, by being effectually called.

And let it be further obſerved, that the perſons here ſpoken to, were but now awakened; in great diſtreſs about their ſouls, nor as yet were comforted, or had profeſſed their faith in Chriſt: Hence how very improper is it to draw any argument for the baptiſm of believers children from thence?

Mr. P. * ſays, "According to the moſt authentic church hiſtory, infant baptiſm was practiſed "in the days of the apoſtles, and in the places and "churches

* P. 40.

" churches to whom *Paul* wrote his epiſtles," &c. I would aſk, if any church hiſtory is as authentic, as the hiſtory which we have from God, viz. the bible? Or, are we to rely upon church hiſtory for a divine ordinance, which ſacred hiſtory is ſilent about? *Paul*'s epiſtles ſpeak for themſelves.—— Whether there is one word in all of them about infant baptiſm, I leave the reader to judge. But ſince church hiſtory is referred to, and great ſtreſs laid upon it; it may not be amiſs to examine the teſtimonies of the primitive writers, three of whom are mentioned by Mr. P. and the ſynodical decree.

THE firſt is Origin, whom he aſſerts lived about 100 years after the apoſtle *Paul*. Mr. *Rees*,* ſpeaks of two of theſe men as " teſtimonies pro-" duced by Mr. W. and informs us that *Origin* " flouriſhed about 230 years after Chriſt, and that " the quotations are not *Origin*'s own words, but " a tranſlation of him, of which tranſlation there " are grievous complaints among learned men, " becauſe his works are ſo corrupted and interpo-" lated, that one ſcarcely knows, whether he reads " him, or ſome other officious commentator in his " room; and that the moſt ſtrict ſearchers into " his own proper works, which remain, are not " able to produce out of him any thing in favour " of infant baptiſm, And *Cyprian*, A. D. 250, " pleaded for infant baptiſm, tho' in his day an *Afri-" can* Biſhop (*Fidus* by name) was uneaſy to know " the proper time to baptize infants, which was to " be determined by a Synod (which ſynodical de-" cree

* Againſt Mr. Fowler Walker. P. 152, 153.

" cree I ſuppoſe Mr. P. refers to). This is " ſufficient to give the impartial reader a very " ſtrong ſuſpicion that this was a novel practice, " now to be regulated by a ſynodical decree ; " whereas if the practice had been handed down " from the apoſtle's days, as many do pretend, " what need was there for this decree ?" *

THE writers of the firſt *century* are, *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, and *Polycarp*. † The learned Mr. *Stennet*, againſt *Ruſſen*, quotes ſome expreſſions from *Barnabas* and *Hermas*. ‡ " They are bleſſed, who fixing their hope on the " croſs, have gone down into the water."— And a little after—" We deſcend into the water full of " ſins and defilements, and come up out of it, " bringing forth fruit, having in our hearts the fear " and hope which is in Jeſus." *Hermas*, in his viſion of the building of the church triumphant, repreſented by a tower, has theſe words concerning the explication that was made to him : " What are the reſt of the ſtones which fall by the " water's ſide, and could not be rolled into the " water ? They are ſuch as have heard the word, " and were willing to be baptized in the name of " the Lord ; but then they call to mind that ho- " lineſs is required in thoſe who profeſs the truth, " withdraw themſelves, and again walk according " to their own wicked inclinations :" And more to the ſame purpoſe, ſhewing that they uſed then



* This Quotation varys in Expreſſion, in ſome Sentences, tho' it is the ſame in Senſe.

† Dr. Gill, againſt a Pamphlet entitled, *Divine Right of Infant Baptiſm*. P. 20. ‡ P. 142, 143.

to require a profeſſion of holineſs, or faith before they were baptized by immerſion, denoted by the ſtones rolled into the water.

NOT one word in all theſe firſt writers, according to thoſe who have carefully read them, is to be found for infant baptiſm. "The chriſtian writers of the "ſecond century, which are extant, are *Juſtin "Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, "Minutius Felix, Irenæus*, and *Clemens* of *Alexan-"dria.* * Of all theſe writers there is not one that "ſays any thing of infant baptiſm." There is but one pretended to, by what I can learn, and that is *Irenæus*, who is repreſented by our opponents as ſaying, *That the church received a tradition from the Apoſtles to adminiſter baptiſm to little children, or infants.* Which "Dr. Gill charges as a forgery: "There being no ſuch paſſage in all the works of "*Irenæus*; and defies the whole literary world "to produce or point out any ſuch paſſage "in him." This *Irenæus*, with *Cyprian* and *Origen*, are the three teſtimonies which Mr. P. produces.

I HAVE read, that in the third century, infant baptiſm was ſpoken of; but the firſt that mentions it ſpeaks againſt it, viz. *Tertullian:* And that it was then moved for. And in the fourth and fifth centuries, it got much eſtabliſhed, and ſo prevailed till the reformation: Tho' thro' the ſeveral intermediate centuries, there are teſtimonies to be found againſt the baptiſm of infants.—Which may be ſeen in *Croſby*'s hiſtory of the Engliſh-Baptiſts, and

* Dr. Gill juſt cited, P. 21.

and in the writings of Mr. *Stennet*, and Dr. *Gill*. Thus the reader ſees, how truth from hiſtory preponderates upon the Baptiſt's ſide, and elucidates the point ſo much contended for.

HAVING thus weighed the arguments, which Mr. P. ſays are very imperfectly handled; and finding them light, when put in the ſcales of the ſanctuary: — We now proceed to notice the objections, which, ſays he, are pleaded by our adverſaries.

OBJECTION 1. "Our adverſaries plead, as they "ſay, for believers baptiſm; and they argue to "this effect, viz. infants are not capable of faith: "But there is no warrant to baptize any, but thoſe "that profeſs their faith in Chriſt, and therefore "no infants may be baptized." To remove this objection, he thinks the ſame might have been ſaid, "Againſt circumciſing children, under the "legal, as againſt baptizing them under the chri-"ſtian diſpenſation of the covenant of grace." This miſtake of his may be eaſily ſeen by conſidering 1. Under the law a profeſſion of faith was not required, as a previous qualification to circumciſion: But under the goſpel a profeſſion of faith, by the ſubjects to be baptized, is required, as a previous qualification to baptiſm. 2. God under the former diſpenſation pointed out male infants, as proper ſubjects of circumciſion: But he no where under the preſent diſpenſation points out infants, as being proper ſubjects of baptiſm. 3. He makes a grand miſtake in quoting Rom. 4. 11. and endeavours to make out that circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith to all its ſubjects, and

ſo that baptiſm is now to all a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, upon whom it is adminiſtred: But it is time for him to learn, that neither circumciſion, nor baptiſm, is any where in the holy ſcriptures called a ſeal of the covenant of grace, or of their righteouſneſs.

The text juſt mentioned, is wrongly quoted by Mr. P. thus; "they had yet being uncircumciſed:" Which is, *And he received the ſign of circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of the faith which he had yet being uncircumciſed*, &c. It was a ſeal to *Abraham*: But not to his poſterity.—

Our opponent is not quite ſatisfied with letting the world know, that the Baptiſts are wrong, differing from him: But charges our Saviour, the apoſtle *Peter* and *Paul*, with a miſtake; if his notion is not right in this point, "that parents making profeſſion of their faith, bring in their children with them into a church membership:" * But we have already proved, that this is repugnant to the word of God. Therefore, according to him, Chriſt and his apoſtles have miſſed it. What will not error lead perſons into! Lord enlighten the dark underſtanding, and cauſe the preſumptuous and ignorant to ſee!

The ſecond objection which he mentions is, "There is no expreſs command or example for "baptizing infants." To remove this objection, he firſt puts us upon proving by command or example, that women have a right to the Lord's ſupper;

* P. 44. you have it at large.

per; and then the religious obſervance of the Lord's day. That women have a right to the Lord's ſupper, ſee Acts 1. 13, 14. Chap. 2. 41,—47. and Chap. 5. 9, 14. And as to the religious obſervance of the Lord's day, we are inclined to it from the reſurrection of Chriſt, on that day, and the example of the apoſtles and primitive churches meeting to perform ſome of the moſt ſolemn duties and acts of worſhip on that day, Acts 20. 7. 1 Cor. 16. 2. Now let the *Pedobaptiſts* give us ſuch proof for infant baptiſm. Again, ſays he, "We have an "expreſs command, which has never been rever-"ſed, to adminiſter the initiating ſeal of the cove-"nant, to the children of viſible believers." It would have been well for him to have informed us what he means by the initiating ſeal; if by it he means circumciſion, then I would argue that circumciſion has been either reverſed, or it is yet in force: But it is not in force, therefore it has been reverſed or repealed, and the ſame authority that commanded it to be, has remanded it not to be, as we have already ſhewn. The initiating ſeal of the covenant of grace ſo often mentioned, is antiſcriptural, and I apprehend uſed by many without any proper meaning. For as to the covenant of grace, we have ſhewn it to be ſealed by Chriſt's blood; and as to the promiſes contained in it they are ſealed to the ſoul by the holy Ghoſt: Hence baptiſm can neither ſeal any ſpiritual or temporal bleſſings. And were we to grant, which we don't, that baptiſm is a ſeal, then to adminiſter it to an infant, would be like puting a ſeal upon a blank piece of paper.

Mr. P. thinks if a miſſionary to the Indians ſhould write to us that he had baptized ſuch an Indian & his houſe; and another ſhould write to us that he had baptized the head of ſuch a family and all his, we ſhould very readily underſtand them. * I believe we ſhould, for if one of our baptiſt miniſters was the miſſionary, we ſhould conclude the families were capable of hearing, receiving and obeying the word, as did Cornelius and his family, Lydia and her houſhold, and the jaylor and his; who heard the word, believed and rejoyced in God. We are under no neceſſity of ſuppoſing infants, to be included in the idea of a houſhold; ſince we can find many houſholds, in which there is not one infant.

We will now paſs on to make ſome remarks upon the application of his diſcourſes; and ſhould we find a bitter ſpirit running thro' it, and now and then ſevere reflections upon the baptiſts, we muſt conclude, thoſe are to ſerve for want of arguments; and is what is common when all other refuge fails; and the pains which are the effect of truth, are often diſcovered by bitter invectives, agreeable to what one ſays, "When arguments drive the oppoenents into paſſions and exceſſes, like ſtrong purges, it is a proof of their opperation, that they cauſe griping pains, in the very bowels of the patient." † In his firſt uſe we find him hoping to be kept from a cenſorious ſpirit in all that he ſhould ſay of the baptiſts, (wrongly called by him and others *anabaptiſts*) and I can aſſure him it would have pleaſed me to have found leſs of that ſpirit running thro' his performance, and more of the ſpirit of Chriſt, for whoſe

* P. 47. † Bap. Hiſt. Vol. 2. P. 376.

whoſe ordinance we are contending. Under this uſe he blames us for "taking parents into covenant without their children," and don't heſitate to ſay, "that God never made ſuch a covenant, and its a human device." I ſuppoſe he means the covenant of grace. I would aſk, was *Cain* taken into the covenant of grace with his father *Adam?* Was *Iſhmael* taken into the covenant of grace with *Abraham* his father? Or did *Iſaac* take with him *Eſau* into the covenant of grace? Or were all *David*'s children taken into this covenant with him, when in his laſt Words we hear him ſay; *Altho' my houſe be not ſo with God; yet he hath made with me an everlaſting covenant, ordered in all things and ſure?* Why I judge he means the covenant of grace, is from his aſſerting *Eve* to be a "covenant mother, as *Abraham* was the covenant father of us all:"* And he affirms that "the *Abrahamatical* covenant, including the ſeed of viſible believers, is the covenant of grace." I never before knew that a woman was of the two parties between whom the covenant of grace was made. I deſire to know how many covenants of grace Mr. P. can inform the world of? He has told us of three, and if he means by *Noah*'s covenant a covenant of grace, which he brings in upon mentioning *Eve*'s and *Abraham*'s covenant: then he makes four. 1. He ſays the covenant of grace was primarily and principally with the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as the ſecond Adam and with his ſeed. †— 2. It was with *Abraham.*‡— 3. It was with *Eve.*§— 4. With *Noah*: And yet ‖ he tells us of "two covenants repreſented to us in the holy ſcriptures." The reader may eaſily ſee the confuſed notions he has

* P. 48. † P. 16. ‡ P. 18. § P. 48. ‖ P. 15.

has of the covenant, and as such needs not, much wonder at his error, in trying to make the world believe, that children are always taken into the covenant of grace with their parents. This opinion of his is too repugnant to scripture, to palm upon the world; since all the children of *Adam* were not taken into the covenant of grace with him; which covenant was revealed to him soon after his fall! For if this had been the case all his posterity would have been saved, (but perhaps it would have suited Mr. P. better to have mentioned *Eve*, since he makes her to be the covenant head.) Also *Abraham* had an excluded *Ishmael*; *Eli* had a wicked *Phineas* and *Ophni*; and *David* an ungodly *Ammon* and *Absalom*: so that we see the covenant of grace which was revealed unto *Adam*, *Abraham*, *Eli* and *David* into which they were taken, and to whom it was confirmed, did not include all their children. Indeed *David* and all *Abraham*'s spiritual seed * may well rejoyce, in that theirNames are written in the Lamb's book of life; but not so their natural seed, as such.

*Uzziah*'s offence which Mr. P. mentions, is that which I would earnestly recommend to his consideration; his blinded zeal without a divine warrant, moved him to touch the ark and try to keep it up, which touch was fatal.

I MUST deny that "the *Abrahamatical* covenant is the foundation of ordinances," † for it is God's command which gives being to them, and which must be the foundation of them, and not *Abraham*'s covenant, or else how can we account for *Abraham*'s having

* Gal. 3. 29. † P. 50.

having the covenant made to him twenty four years before the ordinance of circumcision took place *? Why did he remain so long after the covenant was made with him, before he and his were circumcised? because he had no divine command for it, consequently no right. If ordinances originate from the Abrahamatic covenant, why was not the passover sooner observed? Yea, why was it so long before baptism and the Lord's supper were practised?

In P. 50. "He informs us, that it is a great injury done to the children of believing Parents, to deny them the right of baptism." This injury he makes to consist in their being cut off from the covenant and privileges of it, into which God has grafted them. It would be well to observe. 1. If God has grafted them into the covenant, man cannot pluck them from or out of it. 2. If it is God's work to graft them into the covenant, then man cannot do it, neither by baptism, nor by virtue of his faith, which in the first sermon he so earnestly contends for: Hence we may conclude it to be mere noise without any substance, respecting our excluding children from the covenant, or not bringing them into it. Mr. P. and all the men in the world cannot cut off one person from the covenant of grace, whom God has grafted into it: God's work is sure, whose purposes vain man cannot frustrate. As to the Legacy which he mentions being left to children in the new testament, by Christ the Testator; what is it to them as such? Just nothing. What is it to them as believers children? Not baptism nor the Lord's supper; for the scripture is silent about any such thing.

In a marginal note † he speaks of re-baptizing, and wants to know how often it may be repeated. We don't hold to re-baptizing, so Mr. P. will excuse me for not answering his question. The mode of baptism by dipping then is introduced, which he endeavours to overthrow. Upon the mode let us a little dwell. ‡ "As to the



* Gen. 12. 3. and 17. 1, 2, &c. † P. 52. ‡ Dr. Gill against Dickenson.

" lexicographers and criticks, upon the greek language, " they agree that the word *Baptizo*, ſignifies in its " firſt and primary ſenſe, to dip or plunge; and " only in a ſecondary and conſequential ſenſe, to waſh; " but never to pour or ſprinkle, there being no proper " waſhing but what is by dipping; and for this we appeal " to all the writers of this kind.——*Scapula* renders " *Baptizo*, by *mergo, ſeu immergo, ut quæ tingendi, aut* " *abluendi gratia aquæ immergimus*, to dip or plunge " into, as what for the ſake of dipping or waſhing we dip " into water." Item. " *mergo, ſubmergo, abruo aqua*, " alſo to *plunge, plunge under, overwhelm in water.*"

*Stephens* gives the ſame ſenſe of the words, and ſo " *Schrevelius*, who renders *Baptizo*, by *baptizo, mergo,* " *lavo, baptize, plunge, waſh. Parſor* only renders it *bap-* " *tizo, baptize.*——— And *Leigh* in his critica ſacra, ob- " ſerves, that the nature and proper ſignification of it, " is to dip into water, or to plunge under water;" " and " refers to Joh. 3. 22. Matt. 3. 16. Acts 8. 38. and " cites *Caſaubon, Bucanus, Bulinger* and *Zanchy*, as agree- " ing and teſtifying to this ſenſe of it: And baptiſma he " ſays is dipping into water, or waſhing with water: To " which I may add the Lexicon compiled by *Budæus,* " *Conſtantine*, and others who render the word *Baptizo,* " by *immergo, mergo*, &c. *plunge, plunge into*, &c." And other *greek* criticks might be produced who affirm the ſame tho' theſe at preſent may ſuffice. Indeed Mr. P. " ſays the words uſed for baptiſm ſignify aſperſion as plainly as immerſion," but quotes no proof for it. His criticiſm on baptizo, to form aſperſion from thence, gives the world as plain a ſpecimen of his accuracy and knowledge in the Greek language, as that does on *auton*:* He tells us, it " is a pronoun relative, and ſignifies others that he brought in the light of his own faith." Every ſmatterer in the Greek language may know *auton* is a pronoun relative, and muſt relate to ſome antecedent, which antecedent in Acts 16. 33 is the Jaylor in perſon, and not in action; ſo that the unlearned reader need not

* P. 7.

not be deceived by his falſe gloſs upon it. His criticiſm on the prepoſitions *apo* and *eis* in Matt. 3. 16. and Acts 8. 38. is obſolete and of little ſervice to his cauſe, which (ſays he) "ought to be rendered *from* the water, and *to*, or *unto*, or *towards*." I muſt confeſs this is a pretty way to impoſe upon the unlearned, and lead them to an implicit faith, as is the caſe with the Roman Catholicks: But I would have the reader know that thoſe texts are rightly tranſlated, and Mr. P. himſelf muſt confeſs that *apo* & *eis* ſignify into and out of in the following, as well as many other paſſages. Mat. 8. 31, 32. Mark 5. 13. Luk. 4. 35,—41. and 8. 29,—33. and Matt. 25. 46. Who will dare to ſay the unclean ſpirits were not *in* the man, but only by his ſide or *near* to him; and ſo did not go *out of* but *from* him? And who will ſay the Devils only went *to* the ſwine, and not *into* them, and that the ſwine run, only down *to* the water, and not *into* it? And—the righteous only go *to* and not *into* eternal life? And the wicked only go *to* and not *into* everlaſting puniſhment? None but ſuch who deny that *apo* & *eis* ſignify *out of* and *into*.

Is it not evident that Chriſt was baptized of John *in* the river Jordan, when we here the Evangeliſt ſay that *Jeſus — was baptized of John* in *Jordan*? * Many of the *Pedobaptiſts* confeſs that immerſion was the primitive mode of baptiſm. † "Biſhop *Burnet*, upon the commiſſion, in Matt. 28. 19. by the firſt teaching or making of diſciples, that muſt go before baptiſm, is to be meant the convincing of the world that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the true Meſſias, anointed of God with a fullneſs of grace and the holy Spirit without meaſure; and ſent to be the ſaviour and redeemer of the world; and when they were brought to acknowlege this, then they were to baptize them, to initiate them to this religion, by obliging them to renounce all idolatry and ungodlineſs, as well as all ſecular and carnal

 "luſts

* Mark. 1. 9. † In his expoſition upon the 39 Articles, P. 300.

" luſts, and then they led them into the water ; and with " no other garments but what might cover nature, they " at firſt laid them down in the water, as a man is laid " in a grave, and then they ſaid theſe words, I baptize " or waſh thee in the name of the Father, Son and holy " Ghoſt : Then they raiſed them up again and clean gar- " ments were put on them : From whence came the phra- " ſes of *being baptized into Chriſt's death*, of being *buried " with him by baptiſm, into death :* Of our being *riſen " with Chriſt*, and of our *putting on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, " of *putting off the old man*, and putting *on the new*. After " baptiſm was thus performed, the baptized perſon was to " be further inſtructed in all the ſpecialties of the chri- " ſtian religion : And in all the rules of life that Chriſt " had preſcribed."

Mr. *Richard Baxter*, in his paraphraſe on the new teſtament with notes, upo.* the following texts ſpeaks thus, Matt. 3. 5, 6. " So glad were the people to hear " that the kingdom of the Meſſiah was at hand, that they " all flock'd to him to be baptized, profeſſing repentance, " that they might be prepared for the kingdom. Note 1. " We grant that baptiſm then was by waſhing the whole " body : and did not the differences of our cold country " as to that hot one, teach us to remember [I will " have mercy and not ſacrifice] it ſhould be ſo here.— " And on Rom. 6. 4. Therefore in our baptiſm we are " dipped under the water, as ſignifying our covenant pro- " feſſion, that as he was buried for ſin, we are dead and " buried to ſin, that as the glorious power of God raiſed " him from the dead, ſo we ſhould riſe up to live to him " in newneſs and holineſs of life. —Likewiſe on Co'oſ. " 2. 12. And its more than a circumciſion of your luſts " that you have in Chriſt ; they are dead and buried with " him : for ſo your baptiſm ſignifieth, in which you are " put under the water, to ſignify and profeſs that your " old man, or fleſhly luſt is dead and buried with him ; " and you riſe thence to ſignify and profeſs that you " riſe to newneſs of life, and heavenly hopes, thro' the " belief of God's works that raiſed Chriſt from the dead."

Mr,

Mr. *Burket*, on Rom. 6. 4. and the famous Dr. *Witsius*, with a number mentioned by Mr. *Stennet* againſt *Ruſſen*, ſome of whom are, *Daille*, *Monſieur Morus*, *Philippus à Limbroch*, *Joſeph Mede*, Dr. *Taylor*, Biſhop of Down and Conner, Dr. *Barrow*, Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, Dr. *Burnet*, Dr. *Fowler* Biſhop of Gloceſter, Dr. *Cave*, Dr. *Towerſon*, Dr. *Whitby*, all give in that immerſion was the primitive mode of baptiſm. And Dr. *Floyer* in his "Appeal to Dr. "*Addiſon* the Dean, Dr. *Hutchinſon*, Dr. *Chaundeler*, and "Dr. *Brinckes*, and Mr. *Hymberly*. Canons Reſidentaries "of the cathedral church of Litchfield, aſſerts that im- "merſion continued in the church of England 'till about "the year 1600. And he cites ſeveral Authors to prove "that chriſtianity was planted in England by immerſion, "and that it continued in England after the reformation, "during the reign of *Edward* the ſixth, and Queen *Eli-* "*zabeth*; among others he mentions *Bede*, who relates in "his ſecond book, that *Paulinus* baptized King *Edwin* "in York, in the year 627; and at the village Rigin, in "the province of the Bernicii, he baptized a great num- "ber of people in the river glem, &c."

I WOULD not omit what the aſſembly of divines in their expoſition aſſure us, "On Matt. 3. 6. were baptized] "waſhed by dipping in Jordan —— this was by ſpecial "commiſſion, Joh. 1. 33." They ſpeak of the mode of baptiſm likewiſe as fully in expounding "Rom. 6. 4. "Are] Gr. were buried with him by baptiſm] ſee "Coloſſ. 2. 12. In this phraſe the apoſtle ſeemeth to "allude to the antient manner of baptiſm, which was "to dip the parties baptized, and as it were to bury "them under the water for a while, and then to draw "them out of it, and lift them up, to repreſent the burial "of our old man, and our reſurrection to newneſs of life."

MR. *Whitefield*'s teſtimony for the mode ſhould not be omitted, in his ſermon from Phil. 3. 10. he ſays—"this "we have ſhadowed out by the cuſtom of baptizing by "immerſion in the primitive church."——Mr. P— criticiſm upon udata polla, tranſlated in the Engliſh Bible much

much water, which he ſays ought to be *many waters*, makes nothing for his practice; for "the words *polla* "*udata*, many waters, ſignify a large quantity, great "abundance, both in the literal and metaphorical ſenſe "of the phraſe, as it is uſed by the evangeliſt John elſe- "where. See Rev. 1. 15. and 17. 1—15. And by the "Septuagint interpreters, it is uſed even for the waters "of the ſea, Pſal. 77. 19. and 107. 23. and anſwers to "*Mayim Rabbim*, in Cant. 8. 7. *many waters cannot quench* "*love*: Which ſurely muſt refer not to a ſmall, but a "large quantity of water; and which phraſe there the "*Septuagint* render by much water, as we do the "phraſe here." *

THE *Iſraelites* paſſing thro' the red ſea, he thinks makes for ſprinkling, and not for dipping, which may be judged by the reader, after he obſerves them deſcend into the channel, having the waters as walls on both ſides of them, and overſhadowed with a cloud. † Is not this a lively emblem of a burial? Doubtleſs it is.

HE ‡ charges the *Baptiſts* with that which perhaps he muſt confeſs the *Pedobaptiſts* to be the procuring cauſe of (viz.) excommunicating the reformed churches in the world. The *Baptiſts* do not excommunicate them, tho' they do not admit them into their churches, till they have been baptized according to the ſcripture mode. It might not be amiſs to quote what the excellent Mr. Morgan ſays on this point. § "If it be the truth which "we hold, and if it is by practiſing it, we unchurch all "the *Proteſtant* world, no matter how ſoon it is un- "churched. If not, it is not poſſible we ſhould do it— "unleſs the *Proteſtant* world unchurch itſelf, by embra- "cing our principles—and if a number of the *Proteſtant* "world are excluded from the church, it is the principle "of infant ſprinkling, and not we that excludes them; for "if there is an excluſion at all in the matter, that is the "cauſe

* Dr. Gill againſt Dickenſon, P. 102. † Exod. 14. 22. ‡ P. 55. § Againſt F. 2d Vol, P. 172.

" cauſe of it in fact: We can do it only doctrinally.—
" How dreadfully evil then muſt that principle of infant
" ſprinkling be!——Surely that principle cannot be
" true, which in fact has ſuch ill nature and tendency.

His ſecond uſe now comes under notice, he begins it thus: " Learn hence that it is a plain duty to beware " of thoſe zealots who ſet themſelves up againſt our " chriſtian practice of *Infant Baptiſm*, to draw away diſ- " ciples after them; ſome in the Apoſtle's days, and after- " wards, did pervert and ſtrain ſeveral ſcriptures, to make " them patronize their errors." If he means the denial of *Infant Baptiſm*, to be one of thoſe errors, then it cannot be an innovation as ſome would, with Mr. P. make it. The ſpirit and temper which run thro' this ſecond uſe, is enough, without any remarks made by me, to convince the unprejudiced reader of the badneſs of his cauſe; a few paſſages quoted may ſerve as a ſpecimen for the reader to judge the whole by. " Of late *Enthu-* " *ſiaſm* and *Anabaptiſm* have joined hands, and threaten " to ſweep away our glory. The *Anabaptiſts* are almoſt " every where in a fever, or paroxiſm of zeal to make " proſelites to their ſchiſmatical, narrow party.—They " have already ſet up the notorious ſchiſmatical practice " of excommunicating all reformed churches, that do not " run their dangerous lengths: And what further may " not be feared, when enthuſiaſm, inſtead of real chriſti- " anity, leads and governs any part whatever? Would " to God thoſe that are ſeized with this party fever, " might be duly ſenſible of the aims and ends that go- " vern them." &c. &c. &c.

Before I conclude, ſince Mr. P. introduces the *Ana-* *baptiſts* in Germany, to render the *Baptiſts* contemptible now; I would obſerve, that the inſurrection there, by what I can learn, was firſt began by the *Pedobaptiſts*, and then ſome of the *Baptiſts* joined them, whoſe evil actions none of us approve of. Mr. *Stennet* againſt *Ruſſen*, * ſays, " I

* P. 236.

"It ſeems plain from the hiſtory of thoſe times, that the "*Papiſts*, as well as *Proteſtants*, and of theſe the *Pedobap-* "*tiſts*, as well as *Anabaptiſts*, were concerned in them; "and that the vindication of their civil liberties was the "chief occaſion of their riſing."

I DON'T at preſent, recollect any thing material in Mr. P—'s ſermons, but what has been briefly conſidered. And now to all, into whoſe hands this piece may come, I wiſh much grace and wiſdom, ſeriouſly and thoroughly to examine into, and weigh thoſe arguments for *Believer's Baptiſm*; and the invalidity of thoſe for *Infant Baptiſm*. So prayeth him, who was compelled thus publickly to ſpeak, and whoſe endeavours to promote the cauſe of God, are now left to the bleſſing of the all-wiſe Jeſus, who inſtituted this ordinance, and honoured it by paving the way into the liquid grave, wherein his humility and example glorioufly ſhine.

FINIS.

THE END